

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 15, 22, 26, 29, 34 have been amended as outlined below. Support for these can be found, for example, on pages 5-7. No new matter is introduced in any of the amendments.

Drawings

Replacement sheets 1 and 2, containing Figures 1 and 2, amended to overcome the objections outlined on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, are included herewith.

Specification

The specification has been amended to overcome the objections noted on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 22, and 26 have been amended to overcome the objections outlined on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action. The recommended amendment to Claim 32 has not been made because such would, Applicants respectfully submit, introduce an antecedent basis problem.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections

The lack of novelty rejection of Claim 1 over Beckmann, set forth at pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action, is not correct at least because the call records in Beckmann, which the Examiner considers to correspond to the claimed “sensitive information,” do not meet the requirements of the claim, which are that this sensitive information, when downloaded to the device, causes the device to become operational, and also, when erased from the device, causes the device to become inoperative at least in part. Beckmann does not teach or suggest these requirements because the call reports in Beckmann, when downloaded, do not cause any of the workstations 21 to become operational, nor does erasing these call reports cause any of these workstations 21 to become inoperative at least in part. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The same conclusion applies to Claim 5, which is dependent on Claim 1.

The same conclusion applies to Claim 8, which recites the same or similar requirements as Claim 1 insofar as the “sensitive information” is concerned.

The same conclusion applies to Claim 12, which is dependent on Claim 8.

The lack of novelty rejection of Claim 22 over Ryu, set forth at pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, is also incorrect because dynamic memory 309, which the Examiner considers to correspond to the claimed memory, is external to Ethernet interface 303, which the Examiner considers to correspond to the claimed device, whereas the claim calls for this memory to be located “in the device.” Moreover, even if this memory is considered to be in the device, Ryu still does not teach or suggest the requirement that the information that is downloaded “is not retained in the device when the device is powered down.” That requirement is not met in Ryu because the on-line program referred to in [0041], which the Examiner considers to correspond to the claimed “configuration information,” is loaded in flash memory 305, which must be considered to be in Ethernet interface 303 if the dynamic memory 309 is. Since flash memory 305 is non-volatile, this information is retained when the Ethernet interface 303 is powered down, in contradistinction to the claim. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The same conclusion applies to Claims 23-24, which are dependent on Claim 22.

The same conclusion applies to Claim 29, which recites the same or similar lack of information retention requirement as Claim 22.

The same conclusion applies to Claim 34, which recites the same or similar lack of information retention requirement as Claim 22.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The obviousness rejections of Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, 14, and 16-21, set forth at pages 10-14 of the Office Action, should all be withdrawn because the base reference in all these rejections is Beckmann, and Beckmann does not meet the requirements of these claims, which is that the downloaded information causes the device to become operational and also, when erased, renders the device inoperative at least in part. Moreover, none of the secondary references, Tirabassi and Sumner, meet this gap in teaching in Beckmann.

The obviousness rejections of Claims 25-28, 30-33, 35-38, set forth at pages 12-13 of the Office Action, should also be withdrawn because the base reference in this rejection is Ryu, and Ryu does not meet the requirement in all these claims, which is that the downloaded information is not retained in the device when the device is powered down. Moreover, none of the secondary references, Tirabassi and Sumner, meet this gap in teaching of Ryu. In fact, both teach away from this requirement. *See, e.g.*, Col. 6:15-17 of Tirabassi, stating “**non-**

volatile memory 602 [is] used for storing the static images and configuration information.”
(Emphasis added).

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that the application is in good and proper condition for allowance. Early notification of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2007

/Robert C. Laurenson/
Robert Laurenson (Reg No. 34,206)

HOWREY LLP
2941 Fairview Park Drive
Box 7
Falls Church, VA 22042
Facsimile No: (571) 273-8300
Telephone No.: (949) 721-6900 (Pacific Coast)